



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/743,184	03/07/2001	Ari Mannikko	1503-0121P	7070

2292 7590 06/17/2003

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

KIM, SANG K

[REDACTED] ART UNIT

[REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

3654

DATE MAILED: 06/17/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/743,184	MANNIKKO, ARI
	Examiner	Art Unit
	SANG KIM	3654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 June 2003.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 07 March 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 7-11, and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Korhonen, WO 96/20121, in view of Keip, U.S. Patent No. 5921739.

Referring to claims 1 and 19, Korhonen teaches an apparatus for handling stacked units of boards, comprising a stacker carrier 5 capable of moving a plurality of stacked units 2 which can be stacks placed on a support bed 4 which can be pallets in a storage area 1 into storage stacks and off from said storage stacks, respectively, having lift units 15 located on the both side, adapted to the opposite sides of said stacker carrier 5 as shown in FIG. 6, said lift units 15 being individually movable and arranged to cooperate so as to elevate/lower the stacked units 2 of boards resting on said support bed 4, a lift element (no reference number assigned) serving to elevate and lower the lift units 15 using the chain drive between a transfer position and a home position, as shown in FIG. 6.

Korhonen does not disclose enough details of the lift units 15 to determine whether they comprise pivot shafts which are rotatably mounted and/or a plurality of lift elements from Fig. 6.

Keip does teach the lift units 42, 43 rotatably mounted on pivot shafts as shown in FIGS. 2, 3, and 10, and described in column 2, lines 55-58.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the apparatus of Korhonen to include lifting units that can rotate by pivot shafts as taught by Keip to provide a degree of freedom of movement to the lifting units during the engagement of the object to be lifted or transported; and provide another lift element on the other side in order to keep a load level when lifting.

Referring to claim 2, Korhonen teaches the lift units 15 includes load support members (no reference number assigned) as shown in FIG. 6 and, respectively, the support bed 4 includes mating member (no reference number assigned) for locking the support bed 4 to the lift units 15 using at least by two edges on opposite sides of the pallet, at least for the duration of a lifting operation as described on page 7, lines 25-35.

Referring to claims 3 and 9, Korhonen teaches said load support members (no reference number assigned) as shown in FIG. 6, and said mating member (no reference number assigned) are provided with interlocking mating shapes as described on page 7, lines 25-35.

Referring to claims 4 and 10-11, Korhonen teaches said support members (no reference number assigned) are provided with a protruding part (no reference number assigned) forming an angle with the horizontal plane during the lifting operation as shown in FIG. 6.

Referring to claim 7, Korhonen teaches at least two opposite edges of the support bed 4 are provided with mating members (no reference number assigned) capable of locking said support member (no reference number assigned) of said lift units to said support bed 4 as shown in FIG. 6 and described on page 7 lines 25-35.

Referring to claim 8, Korhonen teaches a support bed, and said mating member (no reference number assigned) of said support bed 4 are formed by edges as described on page 7 lines 25-35. Korhonen is silent on the bracket edges slanted downward by an angle from the horizontal plane.

Keip teaches a pallet with the bracket edges slanted downward as shown in FIGS. 3 and 10

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the apparatus of Korhonen to have the bracket edges slanted downward as taught by Keip to provide a different configuration of pallet and to be able to grab with the lifting units.

Referring to claim 20, Keip teaches roller members 61 adapted to run with in column legs 12, 31, 29, 32, as show in Figs. 2-10.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Korhonen's apparatus with Keip's roller members to run on column legs for easier movement of the lifting units.

Claims 5, and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Korhonen in view of Keip as applied to claims above, and further in view of Anderson, U.S. Patent No. 5492067 and Suzuki et al, U.S. Patent No. 4702008.

Referring to claims 5, and 12-14, Korhonen teaches said lift units 15 is actuated by two drive shafts driving said plurality of lift elements, said plurality of lift elements being a plurality of lift chains as shown in FIG. 6, and wherein said drive shafts are

arranged to be driven by at least one drive unit (no reference number assigned) but uses the pressurized-medium drive system actuating the grabber elements as described on page 8 lines 1-2. Korhonen is silent on a drive unit equipped with a variable-frequency inverter and an angular pulse encoder or a similar position transducer.

Anderson teaches a variable-frequency inverter on page 9, claim 2 and encoder 89, 91 on page 6 line 28, but not an angular pulse encoder.

Suzuki et al teaches an angular pulse encoder on page 2 line 27.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the apparatus of Korhonen to include a variable-frequency inverter as taught by Anderson and an angular pulse encoder as taught by Suzuki et al to compensate an angular movement of the drive units when engaging and lifting the stacked units off the support bed.

Claims 6, 15-17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Korhonen in view of Keip as applied to claims above, and further in view of Curran, U.S. Patent No. 4976336.

Referring to claims 6, 15-17, Korhonen teaches said actuator means as shown in FIG. 6 and described on page 8 lines 1-2. Korhonen is silent on the actuator means that is a master and slave actuators.

Curran teaches the actuator means with a master and slave actuators on page 10, claim 1 lines 44 and 59.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the apparatus of Korhonen to include a master and slave actuators as taught by Curran to provide one actuator to control over the other actuator.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's argument filed on 6/4/03 have been fully considered but are not persuasive with respect to claims 1-20.

Applicant argues that there is no combination of Korhonen et al. and Keip teaching or suggesting the combination of elements set forth in claim 1, lifting units which are pivotable. The Examiner disagrees with the applicant as indicated in the rejections above; Keip teaches engagement arms of the lift units 42, 43 which pivots, as shown in Figs. 2, 3, and 10, and described in column 2, lines 55-58.

For claim 20, applicant argues that no combination of Korhonen et al. and Keip teaches or suggest lift units further comprising roller members adapted to run on columnar legs. The Examiner disagrees with the applicant as indicated in the rejections above; Keip teaches roller members 61 adapted to run with in column legs 12, 31, 29, 32, as shown in Figs. 2-10.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sang Kim whose telephone number is (703) 305-3712. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 8:00 A.M. to 5:30 P.M. alternating Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kathy Matecki can be reached on (703) 308-2688. The fax phone numbers are (703) 872-9326 for regular communications and (703) 872-9327 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

SK

6/11/03



KATHY MATECKI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600